



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/510,292

10/06/2004

Volker Pitzal

10191/3638

6476

26646

7590

07/12/2006

KENYON & KENYON LLP
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

EXAMINER

ARGENBRIGHT, TONY MICHAEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3747

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/510,292

Applicant(s)

PITZAL ET AL.

Examiner

T. M. Argenbright

Art Unit

3747

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 October 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/6/04, 5/19/06.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

There is no antecedent for "the wave correction mass". It appears dependency should be from claim 20.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 15, 17, 24, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wagner et al (WO 02/12698 and English equivalent US 6,820,473). In 6,820,473, column 4, line 53, through column 5, line 11, Wagner et al discloses monitoring a diesel engine having fuel injected into the combustion chamber in at least two partial injections. The total volume of injected fuel contributing to torque production is taken into account and a fault is determined using the ratio of setpoint and actual torques.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3747

Claims 16, 18 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner et al (WO 02/12698 and English equivalent US 6,820,473) in view of Gerhardt et al. Wagner et al does not include fuel pressure in determining an injection amount. In column 3, lines 40-49, Gerhardt et al teaches including fuel pressure in the determination of fuel amount. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wagner et al to include fuel pressure in determining fuel amount, as taught by Gerhardt et al, to increase precision of the calculation.

Claims 20, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner et al (WO 02/12698 and English equivalent US 6,820,473) in view of Gerhardt et al as applied to claims 16, 18 and 25 above, and further in view of Kono. Wagner et al does not include a wave correction for fuel mass. Kono teaches calculating a fuel correction amount to eliminate the error caused by reduction in fuel pressure (reduced pressure wave). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wagner et al to correct the fuel amount for pressure reduction to improve precision of the injected fuel amount, as taught by Kono.

Claims 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner et al (WO 02/12698 and English equivalent US 6,820,473) in view of Yasuhara. Wagner et al does not use fuel density to determine fuel mass. In column 18, lines 23-41, Yasuhara teaches using fuel density to determine fuel mass. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wagner et al to include fuel density in the determination of fuel mass to improve control accuracy, as taught by Yasuhara.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

Art Unit: 3747

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).


Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 6,752,126 is an English equivalent of DE 10123035.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to T. M. Argenbright whose telephone number is 571-272-4837. The examiner can normally be reached M-Th 6:30am-3:00pm and alt. Fridays 6:30am-2:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen K. Cronin can be reached on 571-272-4536. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


T. M. Argenbright
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3747